



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/730,169	12/05/2000	Tim Opstrup	41EB-1045	8052

7590 04/13/2004

John S. Beulick
Armstrong Teasdale LLP
Suite 2600
One Metropolitan Sq.
St. Louis, MO 63102

EXAMINER

FISCHER, ANDREW J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3627	

DATE MAILED: 04/13/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/730,169

Applicant(s)

OPSTRUP ET AL.

Examiner

Andrew J. Fischer

Art Unit

3627

MW

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 February 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 and 12-14 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 and 12-14 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Acknowledgements

1. Applicants' amendment filed February 17, 2004 (Paper No. 9) is acknowledged.

Accordingly, claims 1-10 and 12-14 remain pending.

2. This Office Action is written in OACS. Because of this, the Examiner is unable to control formatting, paragraph numbering, font, spelling, line spacing, and/or other word processing issues. The Examiner sincerely apologizes for these errors.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC §102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. §102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States. . . .

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. Claims 1-3, 7, 9, and 12, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Ramamurthi (U.S. 5,251,144). Ramamurthi discloses: receiving information concerning the tool from a user via the device (130); comparing the received product specification information (within knowledge base 152); displaying a useful remaining life of the tool (on 144); receiving information pertaining to features selected by the user (the features being drill size or other features shown in Figure 6); receiving information a part name (the "Drill #"); displaying a

Art Unit: 3627

specification of the tool (Table 1); displaying information pertaining to how the tool is made (see Table 1: "cast iron" means that the tool was cast as opposed to drawn).

5. Claims 4 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Purcell (WO 97/44749)("Purcell '749"). Purcell '749 discloses receiving information concerning a tool (inherent since Purcell '749 discloses "products" and a tool is a product); comparing the received product specification information (description) with pre-stored information on tools (all stored information is "pre-stored")(the comparison is between two products with the information being name of the product (*i.e.* part name), description and price); displaying the information (inherent); receives approval information (displaying credit card information); displaying funding request (an order); displaying condition (e.g. new or used); displaying a quote for the tool (the asking price); and a graphical user interface (inherent in the Internet).

6. Claims 1-3, 7, 9, 12, and 14, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Sirosis (U.S. 6,401,056 B1).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 3627

8. Claims 1-3, 7, 9 and 12, as understood by the Examiner, are alternatively rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ramamurthi.¹ It is the Examiner's principle position that the claims are anticipated because of the inerencies noted above since *e.g.* Ramamurthi states that knowledge base 152 may be distributed over other storage devices (column 4, ~lines 56-59).

However if not inherent, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Ramamurthi to include the claimed network and server structure. Such modifications would have allowed for greater ease of expansion of the system by placing computer 134 on a network such as the Internet.

9. Claims 6, 8, 10, and 12-14, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ramamurthi in view of Johnson et. al. (U.S. 6,023,683)("Johnson '683"). Ramamurthi discloses as discussed above but does not directly disclose displaying a funding request and price. Johnson '683 teaches an electronic requisition system which displays funding requests and prices. Therefore it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Ramamurthi as taught by Johnson '683 and tie Ramamurthi system to Johnson '683's system. Such a modification would have helped automate the entire system by allowing for the ordering of *e.g.* new drills without having to manually type in drill information. By tying the systems together on a network such as the Internet, data entry is reduced in addition to human errors associated with data entry.

10. The Examiner recognizes that Ramamurthi does not directly disclose, *e.g.*, the name of the plant where the tool is manufactured. However, these missing elements in Ramamurthi are

¹ See MPEP §2112 expressly authorizing alternative §102/§103 rejections when the question of inherency is present in the anticipation rejection.

Art Unit: 3627

only found in the nonfunctional descriptive material and are not functionally involved in the steps claimed (i.e. the steps of “displaying” is in no way dependent upon the content of the what is displayed). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to substitute the content of Ramamurthi with any type of content. The descriptive material will not distinguish the claimed invention over the prior art in terms of patentability because the data does not functionally relate to the steps in the method. See *In re Gulack*, 703 F.2d 1381, 1385, 217 USPQ 401, 404 (Fed. Cir. 1983); *In re Lowry*, 32 F.3d 1579, 32 USPQ2d 1031 (Fed. Cir. 1994). See also MPEP §2106 IV B.

11. Furthermore, the Examiner recognizes that Ramamurthi does not *directly* disclose the claimed server structure. However if the sever structure was not inherent, it too would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Ramamurthi to include the claimed server structure. It is the Examiner’s position that absent evidence of new or unexpected results, it is not inventive in terms of patentability to take one or more servers ($S_1, S_2, S_3, \dots S_N$) which perform one or more tasks ($T_1, T_2, T_3, \dots T_N$) and add (or subtract) an additional number of servers (X) to perform all or part of the same tasks by allocating the tasks between the various servers (*i.e.* S_1 and S_{N+1} perform T_1 ; S_2 and S_{N+2} perform T_2 ; S_3 and S_{N+3} perform T_3 ; ... while S_N and S_{N+X} perform T_N). The prior art is replete with examples showing why such scaling (both increasing and decreasing the number of servers) is desirable.²

² See *e.g.* Watson (U.S. 6,223,209 B1) disclosing distributed satellite world wide web servers containing identical information placed strategically throughout the Internet so as to be close to all potential clients to help reduce traffic bottlenecks; Midgely et. al. (U.S. 5,592,611 A) disclosing additional servers as a stand-in for a failed server so that client service requests are transparent to the user; Kriegsman (U.S. 6,370,580 B2) disclosing multiple servers as secondary web servers to optimize file transfers; Burns et. al. (U.S. 6,298,373 B1) disclosing cache servers

In other words, a modification increasing the number of servers (*e.g.* having two servers perform a task previously performed by one server) is analogous to making functions, structures, or actions separable. It is the Examiner's position that when the difference between the claimed invention and the prior art is that the prior art does not disclosed an element as separable, as a matter of law, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to make the element separable. See MPEP §2144.04 V. C. and *In re Dulberg*, 289 F.2d 522, 523, 129 USPQ 348, 349 (CCPA 1961). As noted above, it is desirable to allocate the server tasks to various servers to help reduce bandwidth bottlenecks and to help increase the benefits from economies of scale in addition to offering increased security, excellent data management, fast response, and room for expansion.

After review of the entire record, the Examiner finds that Applicants have not asserted any new or unexpected results regarding their hardware configuration (and the software running their hardware configuration) of their server system. Absent such new or unexpected results, such modifications either increasing or decreasing the number of servers or even reassigning tasks to different server(s) would have helped maintain benefits from economies of scale in addition to offering increased security, excellent data management, fast response, and room for expansion while reducing both operating and capital costs.

which download content during off-peak hours to reduce traffic bottlenecks; Stiles (U.S. 6,219,692 B1) which discloses sending essentially identical tasks to multiple servers with differing processing loads to find the most preferred server provider; Zdepski et. al. (U.S. 5,825,884) disclosing an transactional server for TV networks; *How Networks Work*, Chapter 17 describing how sever based structures benefit from economies of scale in addition to offering security, excellent data management, fast response, and room for expansion; and *How the Internet Works*, Chapter 44 implementing a server based architecture in Internet e-commerce.

Art Unit: 3627

12. The Examiner concludes that Applicants have decided not to be their own lexicographer by indicating and defining claim limitations to have meanings other than their ordinary and accustomed meanings. To support this position, the Examiner relies on the following factual findings. First and as noted in the previous Office Action,³ the Examiner has carefully reviewed the specification and prosecution history and can not locate any lexicographic definition(s). Second, the Examiner finds that not only have Applicants not pointed to definitional statements in their specification or prosecution history, Applicants have also not pointed to a term or terms in a claim with which to draw in those statements.⁴ Third, after receiving express notice in the previous Office Action of the Examiner's position that lexicography is not invoked,⁵ Applicants have not pointed out the "supposed errors" in the Examiner's position regarding lexicography invocation in accordance with 37 C.F.R. §1.111(b) (*i.e.* Applicants have not argued lexicography is invoked). Finally and to be sure of Applicants' intent, the Examiner also notes that Applicants have declined the Examiner's express invitation⁶ to be their own lexicographer.⁷ Accordingly

³ See the Examiner's previous Office Action mailed August 14, 2003, Paper No. 6, Paragraph No. 15.

⁴ "In order to overcome this heavy presumption in favor of the ordinary meaning of claim language, it is clear that a party wishing to use statements in the written description to confine or otherwise affect a patent's scope must, *at the very least*, point to a term or terms in the claim with which to draw in those statements. [Emphasis added.]" *Johnson Worldwide Assocs. v. Zebco Corp.*, 175 F.3d 985, 989, 50 USPQ2d 1607, 1610 (Fed. Cir. 1999).

⁵ See again the Examiner's previous Office Action, Paper No. 6, Paragraph No. 15.

⁶ *Id.*

⁷ The Examiner's requirements on this matter were reasonable on at least two separate and independent grounds. First, the Examiner's requirements were simply an express request for clarification of how Applicants intend their claims to be interpreted so that lexicography (or even an *attempt* at lexicography) by Applicants was not inadvertently overlooked by the Examiner. Second, the requirements were reasonable in view of the USPTO's goals of compact

Art Unit: 3627

and for due process purposes, the Examiner gives notice that for the remainder of the examination process (and unless expressly noted otherwise by the Examiner), the heavy presumption in favor of the ordinary and accustomed meaning is not overcome; the claims therefore continue to be interpreted with their “broadest reasonable interpretation” *In re Morris*, 127 F.3d 1048, 1054, 44 USPQ2d 1023, 1027 (Fed. Cir. 1997).⁸ The Examiner now relies heavily and extensively on this interpretation.⁹ Unless expressly noted otherwise by the Examiner, the preceding claim interpretation principles in this paragraph apply to all examined claims currently pending.

13. Functional recitation(s) using the word “for” or other functional terms (*e.g.* “for tracking and disseminating information concerning tools using a network based system” as recited in claim 1) have been considered but given less patentable weight¹⁰ because they fail to add any steps and are thereby regarded as intended use language. A recitation of the intended use of the claimed invention must result in additional steps. See *Bristol-Myers Squibb Co. v. Ben Venue*

prosecution, productivity with particular emphasis on reductions in both pendency and cycle time, and other goals as outlined in the USPTO’s The 21st Century Strategic Plan, February 3, 2003 available at www.uspto.gov/web/offices/com/strat21/index.htm (last accessed March 31, 2004).

⁸ See also *In re Bass*, 314 F.3d 575, 577, 65 USPQ2d 1156, 1158 (Fed. Cir. 2002) (“In examining a patent claim, the PTO must apply the broadest reasonable meaning to the claim language, taking into account any definitions presented in the specification. Words in a claim are to be given their ordinary and accustomed meaning unless the inventor chose to be his own lexicographer in the specification”) (citations omitted); *In re Etter*, 756 F.2d 852, 858, 225 USPQ 1, 5 (Fed. Cir. 1985) (en banc); and MPEP §§ 2111 and 2111.01.

⁹ See 37 C.F.R. §1.104(c)(3) which states in part: “the examiner may rely upon admissions by applicant . . . as to *any matter* affecting patentability [Emphasis added.]”

¹⁰ See *e.g. In re Gulack*, 217 USPQ at 404 (stating that although all limitations must be considered, not all limitations are entitled to patentable weight).

Art Unit: 3627

Laboratories, Inc., 246 F.3d 1368, 1375-76, 58 USPQ2d 1508, 1513 (Fed. Cir. 2001) (Where the language in a method claim states only a purpose and intended result, the expression does not result in a manipulative difference in the steps of the claim.).

Response to Arguments

14. Applicant argues that Purcell does not disclose “receiving a funding request for the tool.”¹¹ The Examiner respectfully disagrees. The acts of paying for purchases with an ordinary credit card has the credit authorization company “receiving a funding request for the tool.”

15. Applicants attempt at traversing the Official Notice findings as stated in the previous Office Action is inadequate.

Adequate traversal is a two step process. First, Applicants must state their traversal on the record. Second and in accordance with 37 C.F.R. §1.111(b) which requires Applicants to specifically point out the supposed errors in the Office Action, Applicants must state *why* the Official Notice statement(s) are not to be considered common knowledge or well known in the art. In this case, while Applicants have clearly met step (1), Applicants have failed step (2) since they have failed to argue *why* the Official Notice statement(s) are not to be considered common knowledge or well known in the art. Because Applicants’ traversal is inadequate, the Official Notice statement(s) are taken to be admitted as prior art. See MPEP §2144.03.

16. Applicants’ remaining arguments filed in Paper No. 9 with their amendment (Amendment ‘A’) have been fully considered but are either moot in view of the new grounds of rejection or are found unpersuasive.

Conclusion

17. Applicants' amendment necessitated the new grounds of rejection presented in this Office Action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP §706.07(a). Applicants are reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 C.F.R. §1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

18. The following references are considered pertinent to Applicant(s)' disclosure: Hogan et. al. (U.S. 6,704,689 B1); Ketonen et. al. (U.S. 6,349,268 B1); Ohtsuka et. al. (U.S. 5,608,845); Husseiny (U.S. 5,210,704); and Hardy et. al. (U.S. 4,525,763).

19. The following two (2) citations to the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure ("MPEP") apply to this Office Action: MPEP citations to Chapters 200, 700, 1800, and 2100 are from the MPEP 8th Edition, Rev 1, February 2003. All remaining MPEP citations are from MPEP 8th Edition, August 2001.

20. Because this application is now final, Applicants are reminded of the USPTO's after final practice as discussed in MPEP §714.12 and §714.13 and that entry of amendments after final is *not* a matter of right. "The refusal of an examiner to enter an amendment after final rejection of

¹¹ Applicants' Remarks, Paper No. 8, Page 7, ¶2.

Art Unit: 3627

claims is a matter of discretion.” *In re Berger*, 279 F.3d 975, 984, 61 USPQ2d 1523, 1529 (Fed. Cir. 2002) (citations omitted). Furthermore, suggestions or examples of claim language provided by the Examiner are just that—suggestions or examples—and do not constitute a formal requirement mandated by the Examiner. Unless stated otherwise by an express indication that a claim is “allowed,” exemplary claim language provided by the Examiner to overcome a particular rejection or to change claim interpretation has *not been addressed* with respect to other aspects of patentability (*e.g.* §101 patentable subject matter, §112 1st paragraph written description and enablement, §112 2nd paragraph indefiniteness, and §102 and §103 prior art). Therefore, any claim amendment submitted under 37 C.F.R. §1.116 that incorporates an Examiner suggestion or example or simply changes claim interpretation will nevertheless require further consideration and/or search and a patentability determination as noted above.

21. In accordance with the USPTO’s goals of customer service, compact prosecution, and reduction of cycle time, the Examiner has made every effort to clarify his position regarding claim interpretation and any rejections or objections in this application. Furthermore, the Examiner has again provided Applicants with notice—for due process purposes—of his position regarding his factual determinations and legal conclusions. The Examiner notes and thanks Applicants for their “Remarks” (Paper No. 9, beginning on page 5) traversing the Examiner’s positions on various points. If Applicants disagree with any additional factual determination or legal conclusion made by the Examiner in this Office Action whether expressly stated or implied,¹² the Examiner respectfully reminds Applicants to properly traverse the Examiner’s position(s) in accordance with 37 C.F.R. §1.111(b) in his next properly filed response. By

¹² *E.g.*, if the Examiner rejected a claim under §103 with two references, although not directly stated, it is the Examiner’s implied position that the references are analogous art.

Art Unit: 3627

addressing these issues now, matters where the Examiner and Applicants agree can be eliminated allowing the Examiner and Applicants to focus on areas of disagreement (if any) with the goal towards allowance in the shortest possible time. If Applicants have any questions regarding the Examiner's positions or have other questions regarding this communication or even previous communications, Applicants are strongly encouraged to contact Examiner Andrew J. Fischer whose telephone number is (703) 305-0292. If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's immediate supervisor, Robert Olszewski, can be reached at (703) 308-5183. The fax number for facsimile responses is now (703) 872-9306.



Andrew J. Fischer
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 3627

AJF
March 31, 2004